



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,120	06/16/2006	Carine Boursier	1032326-000400	1809
21839 7590 02/11/2009 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			EXAMINER OBAYANJU, OMONIYI	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/11/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/08/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that "Simmons does not teach that the storage support is secured against fraudulent access" in claim 1.

In response, examiner respectfully disagree with applicant's argument. According to applicant's specification, a storage support which is secured against fraudulent access is for example, PROM (pg. 2, pp0030). Simmons teaches storing IMEI in a permanent (Non-erasable) memory device (Simmons, pg.2, pp0026) for example EPROM, (Simmons, pg.4, pp0049) which is protected against any modifications or changes.

Applicant also argues that "Simmons's authentication does not establish a secure communication channel between the storage support and the secure electronic module".

In response, examiner respectfully disagree with applicant's argument. In pg. 4, pp0049 of Simmons, teaches that an authentication (challenge process) is performed between the storage support (Memory, EPROM, storing the IMEI) and the secure module device (SIM), and establishing secure communication channel between the

Art Unit: 2617

storage support and the secure electronic module (sending IMEI from the Mobile equipment to the SIM, upon establishing (confirming) suitability or security).

Applicant also argues that Portalier does not teach "a handset operating system, which controls authentication of the IMEI storage support by a secure electronic module which is connected to the aforementioned connector in order to establish a secure communication channel between the storage support and the module and transmission of the IMEI over the secure channel to the secure electronic module".

In response, examiner respectfully disagree with applicant's argument. As stated in the first office action, examiner did not allege that Portalier teaches the limitations as stated above. However, Simmons discloses a handset operating system (fig. 1, Microcontroller), which controls authentication of the IMEI storage support by a secure electronic module (pg. 3, pp 0030) which is connected in order to establish a secure communication channel (pg.3, pp0042, challenge verification) between the storage support and the module and transmission of the IMEI over the secure channel to the secure electronic module (pg. 4, pp 0049 lines 9-12).

But, Simmons fails to teach the connector for a secure electronic module. However, Portalier teaches the connector for the secure electronic module (SIM card) in (fig. 1, #11 and pg. 5, lines 1-3). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify the terminal equipment

teachings of Simmons with the connector for connecting the SIM card taught by Portalier to achieve a secured communication link between the two apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simmons (US Publication No. 20040043792) in view of Portalier et al (UK Patent Application GB2355892).

As to **claims 1,5,8, and 12**, Simmons teaches mobile telephone handset (fig. 1, #10), characterized in that it comprises: a storage support (fig. 1, memory) which is secured against fraudulent access, which stores the IMEI of the handset (pg. 2, pp 0026, lines 1-4); a handset operating system (fig. 1, Microcontroller), which controls authentication of the IMEI storage support by a secure electronic module (pg. 3, pp 0030) which is connected to the aforementioned connector in order to establish a secure communication channel (pg.3, pp0042) between the storage support and the module and transmission of the IMEI over the secure channel to the secure electronic module (pg. 4, pp 0049 lines 9-12).

Art Unit: 2617

Simmons fails to teach the connector for a secure electronic module. However Portalier teaches the connector for the secure electronic module (SIM card) in (fig. 1, #11 and pg. 5, lines 1-3). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to modify the terminal equipment teachings of Simmons with the connector for connecting the SIM card taught by Portalier to achieve a communication link between the two apparatus.

As **to claims 2 and 9**, Simmons teaches wherein the operating system (fig. 1, Microcontroller) controls the transmission of the IMEI to a mobile telephone operator by means of a secure OTA channel (pg. 3, pp 0038, lines 4-8).

As **to claims 3 and 4**, Simmons teaches wherein it comprises a secure electronic module (SIM card) associated with the operator connected to the connector (pg. 3, pp 0028).

As **to claim 6**, Simmons teaches wherein the secure electronic module and the storage support store encryption keys that are adapted to securing the secure communication channel (pg. 3, pp 0041, lines 1-10).

As **to claims 7, 11, and 13-16**, Simmons teaches wherein the secure module blocks the use of the handset when a false IMEI is detected (pg. 3, pp 0038 lines 4-7, and pp 0040).

Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simmons (US Publication No. 20040043792) in view of Portalier et al (UK Patent

Art Unit: 2617

Application GB2355892) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

As to claims 10 and 17, Simmons and Portalier teaches the limitations of claim 9 as discussed above. However, they fail to teach the operator comparing the IMEI with a black list of stolen handsets. Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) as set forth in Paragraph [0003] of the specification background teaches these limitations of claims 10 and 17 (blocking . Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to include the teachings the Applicants Admitted Prior Art in the securing method of Simmons and Portalier in order to achieve the goal of efficiently securing a mobile terminal from an unauthorized use.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

Art Unit: 2617

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OMONIYI A. OBAYANJU whose telephone number is (571)270-5885. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 7:30 - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent P. Harper can be reached on 571-272-7605. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/O. A. O./
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/VINCENT P. HARPER/
Supervisory Patent
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Application/Control Number: 10/583,120
Art Unit: 2617

Page 8